



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/578,993 | 05/11/2006 | Eugene Sherry | 5000-061503 | 5104 |
| 28289 | 7590 | 12/31/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219 | | | JOHNSON, AMY COHEN | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2859 | | |
| | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | 12/31/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

TH

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/578,993 | SHERRY ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Amy Cohen Johnson | 2859 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-22 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-22 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/23/07.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 25-27 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claims 25-27 fail to further limit the independent claims from which they depend since, they are directed to functional language and since they only further define the preamble of the claims, wherein the preamble in apparatus claims is not given patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 16-22, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Orzheshkov et al. (Soviet Union Application SU 3299887A).

Orzheshkov et al. teaches a gauge for use in a surgical procedure to determine a first angle in a first plane and a second angle in a second plane, said gauge comprising: a body (1); a plumb bob (5) mounted to said body so as to hang under the influence of a local gravitational field, said plumb bob being rotatable relative to said body in both said first plane and said second plane so as to determine said first angle and said second angle respectively (Abstract, Figs. 1 and

2); and a connector disposed on said body for connection to a predefined site of a patient (Abstract, Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 1: It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). See MPEP 2106 and 2111.04. In this case the intended use is considered to be for connection to a prosthetic component since the structure of the connector is not positively claimed.

Orzheshkov et al. teaches the gauge wherein a universal joint rotatably mounts said plumb bob to said body (Fig. 1).

Orzheshkov et al. teaches the gauge wherein said universal joint is any one of: a ball joint; a singular pivot-point joint (Fig. 1); an eye end joint; a tie rod end joint; or a rose joint.

Orzheshkov et al. teaches the gauge wherein said first plane is orthogonal to said second plane (Abstract, Figs. 1 and 2).

Orzheshkov et al. teaches the gauge wherein said plumb bob includes a pointer (Abstract, Fig. 1).

Orzheshkov et al. teaches the gauge wherein said body includes markings (3) disposed adjacent said pointer (Abstract, Fig. 2).

Orzheshkov et al. teaches the gauge wherein a first sub-set of said markings corresponds to angular increments of said first angle and a second sub-set of said markings corresponds to angular increments of said second angle (Abstract, Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 25-27: Claims 25-27 are directed to functional language which does not further limit the independent claim from which the claims depend. Therefore, the subject matter of these claims is considered to be intended use of the apparatus and, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). See MPEP 2106 and 2111.04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16, 17, 19-22, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leone, Jr. (U. S. Patent No. 6,302,890) in view of Shue et al. (U. S. Patent No. 2,385,424).

Leone, Jr. discloses a gauge (10) for use in a surgical procedure to determine a first angle in a first plane, said gauge comprising: a body (24); a level (40) mounted to said body so as to act under the influence of a local gravitational field, so as to determine a first angle (Figs. 1-5, Col 6, line 62-Col 7, line 27); a connector (12) disposed on said body for connection of said gauge to a prosthetic component of a predefined site of a patient (Figs. 1-5, Col 5, lines 52-63, Col 7, line 48-Col 8, line 45); wherein said surgical procedure is the insertion of an acetabular cup into a reamed acetabulum during hip replacement surgery (Col 1, lines 1-20, Col 1, line 63-

Col 2, line 44); wherein said angle corresponds to an aversion of said acetabular cup relative to the reamed acetabulum (Col 1, lines 1-20, Col 1, line 63-Col 2, line 44); wherein said angle corresponds to an abduction of said acetabular cup relative to the reamed acetabulum (Col 1, lines 1-20, Col 1, line 63-Col 2, line 44).

Leone, Jr. does not disclose the gauge wherein the level is a plumb bob mounted to said body so as to hang under the influence of a local gravitational field, said plumb bob being rotatable relative to said body in both said first plane and said second plane so as to determine said first angle and said second angle respectively.

Shue et al. discloses a gauge wherein the level is a plumb bob (Figs. 1-3) mounted to said body so as to hang under the influence of a local gravitational field, said plumb bob being rotatable relative to said body in both said first plane and said second plane so as to determine said first angle and said second angle respectively (Col 1, lines 5-13, Col 2, lines 4-46); wherein a universal joint rotatably mounts said plumb bob to said body (Col 2, lines 30-46); wherein said first plane is orthogonal to said second plane (Col 1, lines 5-13); wherein said plumb bob includes a pointer (14); wherein said body includes markings (20) disposed adjacent said pointer; wherein a first sub-set of said markings corresponds to angular increments of said first angle and a second sub-set of said markings corresponds to angular increments of said second angle (Fig. 1, Col 3, lines 3-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the spirit level of Leone, Jr. with a plumb bob, as taught by Shue et al., in order to more accurately indicate an angular position with the use of a pointer and angle scale

and in order to determine the angle with respect to two perpendicular axis, increasing the accuracy of the apparatus.

6. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orzheshkov et al. in view of Afromowitz (U. S. Patent No. 4,627,172).

Orzheshkov et al. discloses the gauge as described above in paragraph 3.

Orzheshkov et al. does not disclose a gauge wherein movement of the plumb bob relative to the body is damped.

Afromowitz discloses a plumb bob wherein movement of the plumb bob relative to the body is damped (Col 1, lines 18-21, Col 6, lines 56-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dampen the movement of the plumb bob of Orzheshkov et al., as taught by Afromowitz, in order to create a more accurate plumb bob reading and a more stable plumb bob by reducing the effects of minor movements on the plumb bob.

7. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul (U. S. Patent No. 5,314,432) in view of Arthur (U. S. Patent No. 1,495,629).

Paul discloses a gauge (10) for use in a surgical procedure to determine a first angle in a first plane and a second angle in a second plane (Figs. 1-9), said gauge comprising: a body (20); a first level (26) mounted to said body so as to act under the influence of a local gravitational field, said first level being mounted so as to determine said first angle; a second level (27) mounted to said body so as to hang under the influence of a local gravitational field, said second level being mounted so as to determine said second angle (Figs. 1, 3-9, Col 3, lines 44-54); a

connector (36) disposed on said body for connection of said gauge to a predetermined site of a patient (Figs. 1, 7, 9, Col 3, line 44-Col 4, line 7).

Paul does not disclose the gauge wherein said first level is a first plumb bob and wherein said second level is a second plumb bob; wherein said first plumb bob is mounted to said body for rotation about a first axis and the second plumb bob is mounted to said body for rotation about a second axis, whereby said first axis is orthogonal to said second axis.

Arthur discloses a gauge wherein the level is a plumb bob (19) which is mounted to a body so as to hang under the influence of a local gravitational field, said plumb bob being rotatable relative to said body in a first plane so as to determine said first angle (Fig. 1, Col 2, lines 60-101); wherein said plumb bob is mounted to said body for rotation about a first axis (Fig. 1, Col 2, lines 60-101).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the spirit levels of Paul with plumb bobs, as taught by Arthur, in order to more accurately indicate an angular position with the use of a pointer and angle scale (Arthur, Col 1, lines 9-29).

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 16-22, 25-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 161-193 of copending Application No. 10/494085. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to a gauge for use in a surgical procedure comprising a plumb bob wherein the surgical procedure is a hip replacement surgery.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-22, 25-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. Regarding Applicant's arguments that Afromowitz does not disclose a plumb bob, Examiner disagrees. Afromowitz discloses a weight (22) suspended from a rod (12) which reacts to gravity. Although Afromowitz may not directly state that the weight (22) and rod (12) act as a plumb bob, the fact that the weight (22) is suspended from rod (12) which is allowed to

pivot and react to the pull of a local gravitational field, the apparatus of Afromowitz is considered to be a plumb bob.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following disclose level devices Duncan et al. (US PGPUB 2007/0083214), Sherry et al. (US PGPUB 2007/0051002), Echeverri (US PGPUB 2006/0184177), De la Barrera (US PGPUB 2006/0095047), Bryan et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,949,105), Leone, Jr. (U. S. Patent No. 6,623,488), Liu (U. S. Patent No. 5,191,714), Froning et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,571,243), and Arnst (U. S. Patent No. 1,003,863).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy Cohen Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2238. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5 pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean A. Reichard can be reached on (571) 272-1984. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ACJ
December 26, 2007

G. Bradley Bennett
G. BRADLEY BENNETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AV 2859